

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

~~EX-PARTIS OFF-LATE FILED~~

96-98

From: Stuart Gold
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu. Apr 3, 2003 7:01 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

RECEIVED

SUNSHINE PERIOD

APR 15 2003

Stuart Gold (dallasthecow@netzero.net) writes.

I request one thing of you before you officially try to snuff out linesharing. Go to <http://w.dslreports.com/> and read the reviews of the bells vs. all clecs and isps. You will find that the bells quality of service is SUBPAR.

Funny how a company like Covad who uses the same copper loop that the bells do can provide better service. Funny how the bells can throw road blocks and delays in provisioning a line and the clecs and isps can provide better service.

Did you factor this in when deciding to eliminate linesharing?

Obviously not and you didn't factor in price either because the prices are going up!!!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.32.195.13
Remote IP address: 64.32.195.13

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E _____

0

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX-PARTISAN PERIOD
SUNSHINE
ON LATE FILED

96-98

From: Stuart Gold
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu. Apr 3, 2003 4:56 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

RECEIVED
APR 15 2003

Stuart Gold (dallasthecow@netzero.net) writes:

Kevin Martin Quote:

There are, for instance, still many areas where consumers have only one option for their local voice services, he said. I think the states are in the best position to do the impairment analysis.

Hey Kevin:

There are still many areas where there is only one option for broadband!!!

The FCC shot down a satellite merger because there was not enough competition, which included DSL service.

All the sudden you eliminate linesharing, now there is enough competition? Come on now, which is it? Explain!!!!

You contradict yourself repeatedly!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.32.195.13
Remote IP address: 64.32.195.13

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E



DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PAYNE OFF LATE FILED

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-98

From: Stuart Gold
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Apr 4, 2003 7:37 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

RECEIVED

APR 15 2003

SUNSHINE PERIOD

Received by the Commission
7/20/03 12:00 PM

Stuart Gold (dallasthecow@netzero.net) writes:

I appeal to the four commissioners who dissented on the linesharing vote. Since when, ever in the history of the world, has a group of peers, equal in statute, when there has been a majority vote (4 out of 5 dissented) and the majority does not rule?

Some ego this one lone proponent must have to tell you that you all are wrong in your thinking. You all have the right group in mind, the consumer.


There still is time to vote for the consumer and let Mr. Martin know that majority rules and politics should be left to the politicians!

Do not be passive about this issue.

Keep Linesharing!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.32.195.13
Remote IP address: 64.32.195.13

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E



DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED 13012 Amarillo
Austin, TX
Wednesday, October 09, 2002
APR 15 2003

Michael J. Copps
FCC

Dear Michael:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Is this true ? I just got an e-mail and look what it says:

In the front section of the St Petersburg Times here in Tampa, Florida today, there is a *HUGE, FULL-PAGE* Advertisement that reads:

SBC (the Bell phone giant)
shouldn't talk with its mouth full

While SBC is pleading dire gloom and doom to regulators, it tells quite a different story to Wall Street.

On September 23, the Chief Financial Officer of SBC told Wall Street:

"This year we will throw off \$3 billion of cash flow after dividends. The real question is how do we use that cash?

But just five days later on September 28, the very same SBC announced layoffs of 11,000 and said SBC:

"faces financial ruin if regulators don't ease up on the telephone giant."

and "warned of dire consequences for customers."

What in the world is going on at SBC?
www.voicesforchoices.com

I hope that you can see ~~through~~ what they are spewing at you. I am a consumer who has SW Bell for the last 20 some-odd years. They have been this poor bleeding company that has raised my rates continually to break even and in the process purchase Ameritech and PacBell. They are trying to re-create the AT&T Monopoly that was broken up in 1984. They are a public company whose charter is to make money for their stockholders.

Is this ad true ? Then there may not be much difference between the ethical standards of SBC and MCI-WorldCom.

Hold SBC to open their networks for full unbundled competition ! I do not want to be paying them to but the rest of the baby bells using the FCC for protection It is a free market they are a public company. ~~Learn~~ how to cut costs ! Re affordable and provide better / cheaper service to your clientele ! Give them that message !

Sincerely,

John McBride
512-258-7681

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

EX-SUNSHINE PERIOD FILED

96-98

RECEIVED

APR 15 2003

Federal Communications Commission
 47 CFR 1.101

Kind regards,
George Issa

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

d

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

13012 Amarillo

Austin, TX

Wednesday, October 09, 2002

APR 15 2003

Kevin J. Martin
FCCFederal Communications Commission
Office of the secretary

Dear Kevin:

Is this true ? I just got an e-mail and look what it says:

In the front section of *the St Petersburg Times* here in Tampa, Florida today, there is a **HUGE, FULL-PAGE** Advertisement that reads:

SBC (the Bell phone giant)
shouldn't talk with its mouth full.

While SBC is pleading dire gloom and doom to regulators, it tells quite a different story to Wall Street.

On September 23, the Chief Financial Officer of SBC
told Wall Street:

"This year we will throw off \$3 billion
of cash flow after dividends. The real
question is how do we use that cash?"

But just five days later on September 28, the very same
SBC announced layoffs of 11,000 and said SBC:

"faces financial ruin if regulators don't
ease up on the telephone giant."

and "warned of dire consequences
for customers."

What in the world is going on at SBC?
rraM.voicesforchoices.com

I hope that you **can** see through what they are spewing at you. I am a consumer who has SW Bell for the last 20 some-odd years. They have been this poor bleeding company that has raised my rates continually to break even and in the process purchase Ameritech and PacBell. They are trying to re-create the AT&T Monopoly that was broken up in 1984. They are a public company whose charter is to make money for their stockholders.

Is this ad true ? Then there may not be much difference between the ethical standards of SBC and MCI-WorldCom.

Hold SBC to open their networks for full unbundled competition ! I do not want to be paying them to buy the rest of the baby bells using the FCC for protection. It is a free market they are a public company. Learn how to cut costs ! Be affordable and provide better / cheaper service to your clientele ! Give them that message !

Sincerely,

John McBride
512-258-7681

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

96-98

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL SUNSHINE PERIOD

~~FILED OFFICE FILED~~13012 Amarillo
Austin, TX

Wednesday, October 09, 2002

Kathleen Q. Abernathy
FCC

RECEIVED

APR 15 2003

Dear Kathleen:

Is this true ? I just got an e-mail and look what it says:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary*In the front section of the St Peteraberg Times here in Tampa, Florida today,
there is a HUGE, FULL-PAGE Advertisement that reads:*SBC (the Bell phone giant)
shouldn't talk with its mouth full.While SBC is pleading dire gloom and doom to
regulators, it tells quite a different story to Wall Street

RECEIVED

On September 23, the Chief Financial Officer of SBC
told Wall Street:

APR 15 2003

"This year we will throw off \$3 billion
of cash flow after dividends. The real
question is how do we use that cash?"Federal Communications Commission
Office of the SecretaryBut just five days later on September 28, the very same
SBC announced layoffs of 11,000 and said SBC:"faces financial ruin if regulators don't
ease up on the telephone giant."and "warned of dire consequences
for customers."What in the world is going on at SBC?
www.voicesforchoices.com

I hope that you can see through what they are spewing at you. I am a consumer who has SW Bell for the last 20 some-odd years. They have been this poor bleeding company that has raised my rates continually to break even and in the process purchase Ameritech and PacBell. They are trying to re-create the AT&T Monopoly that was broken up in 1984. They are a public company whose charter is to make money for their stockholders.

Is this ad true ? Then there may not be much difference between the ethical standards of SBC and MCI-WorldCom.

Hold SBC to open their networks for full unbundled competition ! I do not want to be paying them to but the rest of the baby hells using the FCC for protection. It is a free market they are a public company. Learn how to cut costs !
Re affordable and provide better / cheaper service to your clientele ! Give them that message !

Sincerely,

John McBride
512-258-7681No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E _____

0